

REMARKS

In discussing *Waclawski*'s teaching of an "interval having an extent that depends on said score," the office action refers to "x-minutes interval, time index sets, col. 8, lines 33-51." Accordingly, as best understood from the office action, the "interval" recited in the claimed step of

"defining an interval corresponding to said resource, the interval having an extent that depends on said score"

corresponds to *Waclawski*'s time interval between evaluations of the function $Z(\omega, t)$.

The office action also appears to suggest that the "score" for a resource corresponds to the value of the $Z(\omega, t)$ function.

The claim, however, recites an

"interval having an extent that depends on said score"

Waclawski teaches nothing like this. *Waclawski* teaches obtaining a series of values, which the office action refers to as "scores." These values, and the times at which they are obtained, yield a time series, $Z(\omega, t)$. Values of $Z(\omega, t)$ are obtained at fifteen-minute intervals, regardless of what the value happens to be. There is no teaching of, for example, obtaining values at ten-minute intervals when $Z(\omega, t)$ is particularly high, or obtaining values at twenty-minute intervals when $Z(\omega, t)$ is particularly low.

In *Waclawski*, the interval between evaluations of $Z(\omega, t)$ does not depend on any "score." The interval is certainly independent on the value of $Z(\omega, t)$. There is no suggestion of the interval between successive values of t in the time series as somehow being dependent on the value of $Z(\omega, t)$.

The secondary reference *Block* does not address this deficiency in the teaching of *Waclawski*. Accordingly, even if it were proper to supplement the teaching of *Waclawski* with that of *Block*, the resulting combination would fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Independent claim 13 recites limitations similar to those of claim 1, and is allowable for at least the same reasons. Independent claims 25 and 26 recite computer-readable media for carrying out the methods recited in claims 1 and 13, and are allowable for at least the same reasons. The remaining claims are dependent claims, which contain the limitations of the independent claims from which they depend. These claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their corresponding independent claims.

Now pending in this application are claims 1-26, of which claims 1, 13, 25, and 26 are independent. No additional fees are believed to be due in connection with the filing of this response. However, to the extent fees are due, or if a refund is forthcoming, please adjust our deposit account 06-1050 referring to our attorney docket "07072-128001."

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9-2-04



Faustino A. Lichauco
Reg. No. 41,942

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906
20876982.doc